

**Ecosystem Management Working Group
SBNMS, Scituate, MA
9:00AM-4:00PM
10 December 2003**

Meeting Summary

Summary of Action Items

1. Working group decides to have alternates. Alternates must be chosen and the contact information given to Ben Cowie-Haskell by January 5, 2004.
2. Electronic copies of materials will be distributed to the members 2 weeks before the next meeting. Paper copies will be sent to Dave and Tom and to others, by request only.
3. Meeting minutes will be posted on the SBNMS website and sent to members via email.
4. During meetings statements of importance and documents, such as the draft action plan, will be projected on a screen so that when corrections are made the group can be clear about what the wording will be.
5. 12 January 2004 from 10am-5pm will be next date for meeting. Ben Cowie-Haskell will poll the members and decided on a date for February (sometime between 2nd-23rd. (Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Fridays bad for some people). The meeting will be held in Boston at a location not yet identified.
6. Ben will clarify whether the SBNMS has the authority to regulate fishing and/or arrange a presentation on the topic for the next meeting.
7. Ben will copy ecosystem-based management documents brought in by David and distribute them to the group at the next meeting.
8. Ben will gather data from the water quality-working group on the results of the testing and/or set up a presentation by Carleton Hunt or Judi Pederson.
9. Les, Peter, Jon, and David will develop a straw man draft document on what SBNMS should consider for a ecosystem based management plan.
10. Tom, Ed, and Dave will present the fishing communities views on what type of ecosystems should be protected.
11. Jon will present a short presentation on the work the Northeast Fisheries Science Center is doing concerning ecosystem-based management of fisheries.

Working Group Attendees

SBNMS EBMWG meeting summary for 12/10/03

Name	Affiliation
John Williamson	SAC
Ben Cowie-Haskell	SBNMS
Peter Auster	NURC
Les Kaufman	Boston University Marine Program
Ed Barrett	Commercial Fishing
Dave Casoni	Commercial Fishing
Tom DePersia	Recreational Fishing
Priscilla Brooks	Conservation Law Foundation
Susan Farady	Ocean Conservancy
Jon Brodziak	Northeast Fisheries Science Center
Deirdre Kimball	NOAA Fisheries
Paul Howard	NEFMC
David Pierce	DMF
Tony Wilbur	Coastal Zone Management

Working Group Members Absent

Dave Wiley, SBNMS
Larry Madin, WHOI
Jerry Hill, Recreational Fishing Industry

Others Present

Deborah Marx (rapporteur), SBNMS

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND OPENING COMMENTS By John Williamson

Opening remarks stressed that this group is made up of a group of individuals that have great expertise and interest in ecosystem management and have an opportunity to create an action plan for SBNMS. Each working group member provided his or her name, affiliation, background, interests, and connection with SBNMS. The working group's contact information was circulated, allowing them to correct errors or add information. No technical advisors were present for the meeting but the group has the opportunity to appoint additional technical advisors if needed.

WHY ARE WE HERE?

Working group formed to develop an action plan that will revise the 1993 management plan. The National Marine Sanctuary Act requires the review and revision of the management plan. The group should identify the goals, objectives, and long term strategies that will be covered in the action plan. The strategies set the priorities, actions, and goals that are used to measure the success of the action plan.

SBNMS EBMWG meeting summary for 12/10/03

The Management Plan Review (MPR) process and how the working group fits into the process:

-SBNMS conducted two rounds of public scoping, first in 1999 and second in 2002 because of long period b/t first scoping and the beginning of the rest of the Management Plan Review. The Sanctuary Advisory Council set up the 12 WG's to respond to public scoping comments. The Management Plan Review process is mandated by Congress to take place every 5 years.

-The working groups will meet once a week for 5 months to draft an action plan. There are approximately 190 people involved in these meetings. In May the action plan will be finalized and given to the SAC for public comment. Then it will be revised and a final plan developed.

The working group process:

-Purpose: to develop an action plan that addresses the problems and opportunities based on public scoping and to develop strategies to solve these problems. These strategies will be broken down further into actions.

-Roles and Responsibilities: The working groups are exempt from FACA. Members selected through public nomination process.

- Chair's role: Administrator and facilitator as well as an objective member to run the meeting.
- SBNMS staff's role: Support and to represent SBNMS. To help keep the meeting going and provide logistical support.
- Technical Advisors: Talk on specific subjects and to present clarification. They have no decision-making authority.
- Public: They can attend the meeting and observe. Their input to the meeting must be transmitted through a working group member that represents their interests. At break and during a caucus the public can communicate to members. A discussion on the pros and cons of public participation occurred. SBNMS has a policy on how the public can participate and the group will follow this.

-Alternates: Needed to represent the constituency if member absent. Members need to keep them informed of what is going on so they can contribute to the meetings when present.

ACTION: Working group decides to have alternates. Alternates must be chosen and the contact information given to Ben Cowie-Haskell by January 5, 2004.

Meeting Mechanics: Agenda, meeting minutes, and draft documents will be posted on the website 7 days before the next meeting and to members 14 days before the next meeting.

ACTION: Electronic copies of materials will be distributed to the members 2 weeks before the next meeting. Paper copies will be sent to Dave and Tom and to others, by request only.

ACTION: Meeting minutes will be posted on the SBNMS website and sent to members via email.

Decision Making: Consensus agreement, if possible. SAC will hear all recommendations and alternative viewpoints is no decision can be reached. Opinions will be given to the group in clear and accurate statements. A straw pole draft action plan is an option for the group. After that is presented to the group objections can be raised and document reworded to reach a consensus.

ACTION: During meetings draft language will be projected on a screen so that when corrections are made the group can be clear about what the wording will be.

ACTION: 12 January 2004 from 10am-5pm will be next date for meeting. Ben Cowie-Haskell will poll the members and decided on a date for February (sometime between 2nd-23rd. (Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Fridays bad for some people) The meeting will be held in Boston at a location not yet identified.

Action Plan: The purpose of the action plan is to deal with specific topics or issues. Its components are:

- a goal statement that address the problems and actions that solve the problem.
- background Material (legislation)
- issue characterization (why there is a problem, why it has not been addressed, the authority for SBNMS to address it, any gaps in dealing with the issue, and who else might aid SBNMS in dealing with the problem)
- an evaluation of existing regulations
- prioritized strategies to address the issues
- activities that address specific actions

The action plan covers the why, what, how, where, who, when, the costs, if action is enforceable, how to evaluate results, and the relation to other action plans.

The final product is a draft management plan (composed of action plans) and an environmental impact statement (if actions will change the regulations or effect users of the sanctuary) that will present a range of alternatives for all actions. @ options for the development of an action plan:

1. A range of action presented to address an issue
2. A consensus recommendation with no range of alternatives or actions.

The group had a discussion on SBNMS fishing regulations and if SBNMS can regulate fishing. Yes SBNMS can recommend a change in regulations. These recommendations

go to New England Fisheries Council for a final decision. The group wants a better understanding and agreement on SBNMS's ability to impact fisheries and what the law says.

ACTION: Ben Cowie-Haskell will supply information on the SBNMS' authority to regulate fishing activities by the next meeting.

Work Plan and Problem Statements: Its purpose is to layout the issue and give it context in relation to the players and regulations.

What is an ecosystem? Its meaning is crucial to its management! It's definition has already been decided on by SAC. See work plan for basic definition. SBNMS is not in itself an ecosystem, it is part of the Gulf of Maine ecosystem.

The working group is dealing with a ecosystem based management plan. SBNMS wants to conserve the sources of products and services not just the resource. We can manage the inputs and outputs to an ecosystem but we can't actually manage the ecosystem.

Goal: Nothing humans do should drive the system away from its productivity or native state. Need to conduct studies based on different management actions. No baseline evidence of what the native state consisted of. Need to look at results in relation of how things are now and how the ecosystem will respond to potential human actions.

The group needs to identify why SBNMS is unique, other than it is part of a larger ecosystem of the Gulf of Maine.

Look to other groups, places, people, and organizations to see what they are doing to manage ecosystems and understand what is ecosystem based management. SBNMS should aim to bring other groups together for a collaborative effort on the topic.

ACTION: Ben Cowie-Haskell will copy ecosystem based management documents brought in by David Pierce and distribute them to the group at the next meeting.

SITE CHARACTERIZATION AND STATUS OF MANAGEMENT, presented by Ben Cowie-Haskell

SBNMS's assessment and monitoring programs:

- Water quality monitoring stations.

The group questioned what is the overall system SBNMS should have to accurately monitor water quality. The group felt that the sampling was not frequent enough or at the right time. How can the group suggest changes? Need data from the samples through a presentation or data from the water quality working group.

ACTION: Ben Cowie-Haskell will gather data from the water quality-working group on the results of the testing and/or set up a presentation by Carlton Hunt or Judi Pederson.

- multibeam topographic data
- MA Bay disposal site effects
- Beam trawl stations
- Juvenile Survey (NMFS)
- Invertebrates sampling (NMFS)
- Impact of Cable Site on seafloor habitat
- Cod movement (link fish movement to underwater landscapes)
- Length of fish changes and ecosystem effects
- who and what using the sanctuary and the spatial distribution
 - survey track lines to count marine mammals and human activity (entanglement risk)
- ocean vessel track lines vs. humpback whale sightings
- right whale data
- seabird data (species and number)
- shipwreck targets
- recreational fishing distribution (tuna)
- commercial lobster catch (vessel trip reports)
- commercial handline gear density
- fishing regulations closure areas (online database in the development)
 - SBNMS comments on closure area recommendations for amendment 13
- NMSP legislation (NMS Act and regs)
- cooperative enforcement program with MA environment police
- education and outreach
- research and monitoring

End of the Road: Sustain resources so they are there in the future (closing fishing is not the goal). Society's values change and the regulations need to change, even if that means regulating fishing. The goals and interests change and this needs to be taken into account in forming the strategies and actions. Use the NMS Act and vague wording to the working group's advantage.

Goal: Conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use.

SBNMS: Protect the source of goods and services. Example of ecosystem based management: sand lance (eels) (issue, goal, information requirements, and possible solutions)

Group discussion on if it is appropriate to protect the source instead of all species (even if they are not fished or used for commercial or recreational benefit)

Group wants to know about special areas such as location of deep boulder fields.

ACTION: Les, Peter, Jon, and David will develop a straw man draft document on what SBNMS should consider for a ecosystem based management plan.

ACTION: Tom, Ed, and Dave will present the fishing communities views on what type of ecosystems should be protected.

ACTION: Jon will present a short presentation on what the state of MA is doing about ecosystem based management and fisheries.

MEETING CONCLUSION

John Williamson reviewed what had happened during the meeting and Deborah Marx read to the group the action items that had taken place during the meeting.